

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed December 2, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicants amend Claims 1-9, 11, 20-27, and 34. Applicants cancel Claims 12-19, 28-33, and 38-49 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants' amendments and cancellations have been done to advance prosecution in this case and not to overcome prior art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Examiner's Response to Arguments**

The Applicants note the Examiner's comment that features upon which the Applicants relied in the preceding response were not recited in the rejected claim. More particularly, the Examiner opined that the feature of a "dynamically reduced vocabulary of a speech recognizer" was relied upon by the Applicants, but not recited in the rejected claim. (See Pending Office Action at 23.) The Applicants respectfully disagree that such a limitation is not found in the claims. Such a limitation is the necessary result of the cited limitation of the control means that is operable "upon such identification, to compile a list of all words of the second set *which are connected with entries connected also with the identified word(s) of the first set.*" However, the Applicants appreciate the Examiner's position and acknowledge that this limitation may be difficult to discern in its current form. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended the claims to clarify this limitation, and where appropriate, have amended the claims to incorporate this limitation. These amendments do not alter the scope of the claims, and should not require an additional search. The Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider all pending claims in light of these amendments.

**Section 102 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-8, 20-24, 26-27, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,018,736 issued to Gilai et al. ("*Gilai*"). The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejections, and reiterate the arguments presented above and in the Applicants' response of February 6, 2004 that *Gilai* fails to disclose, among other things, a dynamically reduced vocabulary that reduces the probability of recognition errors.

Moreover, the Examiner appears to have ignored the distinction between the “first set of words” and the “second set of words” recited in the claims. For example, the Examiner argues that *Gilai* discloses a “best candidates box” comprising “a predetermined number of the highest scoring similarity vector components,” and that this reads on the limitation recited in Claim 1 as “upon such identification, to compile a list of all words of the *second set* which are connected with entries connected *also with the identified word(s) of the first set.*” (See Pending Office Action, at 3 (emphasis added).) At best, though, *Gilai*’s best candidates box is merely analogous to what might constitute a subset of the first set of words (referred to as the “first vocabulary” in the amended claims). The best candidates box has no relation to any distinct second set of words (referred to as the “second vocabulary” in the amended claims).

In an attempt to advance prosecution, however, the Applicants have amended the claims to clarify this limitation and, where appropriate, incorporate this limitation. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

The Examiner also rejects Claims 12, 14, 17, 38, 40, 42-43, and 46-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,479,488 issued to Lennig et al. (“*Lennig*”). The Applicants have canceled each of these claims, without prejudice or disclaimer.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claims 18-19 and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lennig*. The Examiner rejects Claims 9-11, 25, 28-33, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gilai* in view of *Lennig*. The Examiner rejects Claims 13 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lennig* in view of *Gilai*. The Examiner rejects Claims 15, 41, 47 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application No. 0 477688 A2 to Borcharding (“*Borcharding*”) in view of *Lennig*. These rejections are now moot in light of the amendments to the claims, and all pending claims are now allowable. Written notice to this effect is respectfully requested.


**Conclusions**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Darin Deaver  
Reg. No. 50,574

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6408

Date: 2-2-06

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Customer Number:

**05073**